

land. Right now Maryland and Virginia Congressmen of both parties are teaming up again, as in past years, to pressure the Navy into revising plans to cut back Washington's naval weapons plant with its 5,500 employees. The plant makes a variety of missile control devices, antisub gear and other items which management specialists agree could be better produced elsewhere.

PROBLEM OF DUPLICATION

Elimination of military duplication is considered another huge area of potential savings, and here too there is marked resistance to change within each service. Each has its own medical, communications, supply, contracting, auditing, and weather forecasting systems—and each aims to keep them as long as it can.

A congressional staff study recently estimated Armed Forces medical costs at over \$400 million a year, with some 185 hospitals in the United States and 90 overseas. The hospitals have a total capacity of about 105,000 beds and average occupancy of less than 40 percent. They employ about 145,000 people, about 75 percent military and 25 percent civilian.

"It is difficult to conceive," the report said, "of an area that would more readily lend itself to consolidation than medical care. The conditions which require medical service, the facilities for treatment, and the professional standards for medical personnel are virtually indistinguishable among the services."

At Denver, a 350-bed hospital at Lowry Air Force Base keeps only 100 beds in use to care for an average load of 51 patients. Six miles away, Fitzsimons Army Hospital, with 2,078 beds, operates about 900 of them to care for an average of 684 patients.

At Langley Air Force Base in Virginia, a 217-bed hospital keeps 100 beds in use to care for 62 patients, on the average. Six miles away, at the Army's Fort Monroe, there is a 141-bed hospital, in which 35 beds are maintained to care for an average 20-patient load.

DEPOTS DO SAME JOB

Supply distribution is an area of rampant duplication, experts say. In the Southeastern United States, one congressional investigation has found, the Army's Atlanta and Memphis depots, the Air Force's Mobile depot, the Marine Corps supply center in Albany, Ga., and four Navy stock points are all supplying their respective services with the same supplies. Army supply operates through seven different "technical services"—Ordnance, Chemical, and the like—each with specific types of material assigned it. This results in no less than 24 separate Army supply control points in the continental United States—several for each of the seven services—when five to eight could handle the job nicely, according to one management expert.

Military overbuying, lack of standardization, bad inventorying, and slow and costly surplus disposal habits long have been favorite congressional targets. Some progress has been made, budget scanners say, but much remains to be done.

This year the Navy has begun buying extra plane engines on the basis of having a 150-day supply in the pipeline; previously, it insisted on a 210-day supply. Though the shorter cycle would save millions, it took the General Accounting Office, Congress spending guardian, two long battles to get the Navy to change.

Attempts to standardize military footwear have so far eliminated 752 different types and finishes, but 339 types remain. Pentagon experts recently attempted to prescribe a black low men's shoe as standard for all services. The Marine Corps insisted on keeping its mahogany shoe because it matched the bill on the Marine caps, and the Navy insisted on keeping a brown shoe for its fliers because it has been "traditional"—ever since late in World War II.

MANY ITEMS DIFFER ONLY SLIGHTLY

Over 1.3 million common supply items, according to congressional investigators, differ among the services in such relatively minor respects as color, finish, or even just names. Defense officials estimate they could save about \$1 million a year in management expenses alone—not counting procurement savings from placing larger consolidated orders—for every 1,000 items eliminated from the supply system.

The Defense Department has been ballyhooing its "single manager" system as the answer to many of its buying problems. Under this system, one service buys all supplies of one kind for all the services; the Navy does all the fuel purchasing, for instance. But management experts say it's only a step in the right direction.

For one thing, the Pentagon is installing the system very slowly; seven supply categories were put under single managers in 1955 and 1956, but only two more minor categories have been added since then. More important, though, the single manager has authority only to consolidate and place the orders he's given. He has no power to standardize equipment, redistribute excess stocks, or cutback orders.

"If we can extend its use, and raise it to a higher level of command where it can really accomplish more, the single manager system might some day pave the way for a separate single supply service," one would-be reformer wistfully asserts.

FRINGE BENEFITS

Perhaps one of the touchiest areas of theoretical saving in the entire Military Establishment is the vast number of fringe benefits which military personnel now enjoy. Many have grown out of all proportion to the original intent, and now seem beyond uprooting.

Commissaries are a prime example. These food supermarkets were supposed to be set up where there were no private facilities selling at reasonable prices convenient to the post. Now there are over 250 commissaries in the continental United States, many in cities such as Washington and New York.

The right to buy there is now extended not only to people living on the posts, but to military families off the post, reserve and retired personnel, and Public Health officials. Less than 20 percent of the people holding permits to buy at U.S. commissaries now live on the base where the store is located. In Washington, customers at the Walter Reed Army Hospital commissary include such off-base types as a National Institutes of Health neurologist and a World War II Navy nurse, now a reservist, who is the mother of seven children and extremely unlikely ever to return to active duty.

The Government not only employs 9,000 people to man the commissaries, but supplies the buildings, equipment, light, heat, and other services. The customers pay only the original cost of the food, plus transportation charges, and a highly inadequate 3 percent markup to cover all else. Military experts figure the annual running subsidy is \$75 million, not counting depreciation on the buildings and equipment.

The Government also provides medical care and hospitalization for military men and their dependents, including veterinary care for pets; a retirement plan completely Government-financed; quarters, often including all or much of the furniture; in many areas, free libraries and even bus service to public schools; in many cases, subsidized laundry service; free personal travel on military planes and ships if space is available; and burial in Government-owned cemeteries, including plots for pets.

"The military life," comments one Administration official, "is marked by growing socialism and paternalism, literally from the cradle to the grave."

In Support of Salary Increase for Postal and Federal Classified Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of my statement, submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in behalf of an increase in the salaries of postal and Federal classified employees.

It is my sincere hope that this Congress will pass an adequate and needed bill which will reflect an enlightened and realistic Government approach in this matter.

My committee statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, APRIL 29, 1960

The need for an increase in the salaries of postal and Federal classified employees is a problem for which, in my opinion, Congress should find an adequate solution as soon as possible.

As I view it, this problem has two aspects. First, the immediate relief of the need of these employees for added income at a time when rising prices have continued to reduce purchasing power. This is the personal and social aspect of the problem which needs no prolonged consideration and requires the assembly of no additional economic data beyond that which we already have at hand.

Then there is the second phase which has long-range implications. Congress has received recommendations for extensive study of all pay systems according to which employees of the Federal Government are compensated. There is no doubt some merit in this suggestion, but it involves a project which is aside and apart from the essence of this problem, which is providing additional income for these employees and doing it now.

In recent years, Congress has increased postal and classified salaries seven times, beginning in 1945, but it has never adequately increased the pay of all grades. This failure to enable these employees fully to overcome their economic disadvantage is one reason why I am advocating prompt action. These employees have suffered chiefly from delay in raising pay each time it was apparent that the need existed.

For some years Federal Government employees have been suffering along with many other persons from the lessening purchasing power of the dollar. There is a striking difference between salaried Federal employees and many workers in private industry. The latter have continuously received frequent and regular adjustment of their salaries. Business does it in this way because it is a sound policy and one which enables any well-operated enterprise to maintain its position in the labor market.

The Federal Government policy should not be less enlightened. We hear on many occasions statement of the principle that there should be more businesslike methods in Government. There is considerable truth in such a statement, but it does not apply only to certain operating procedures. It applies equally to the treatment which Government or private business accords its employees.

Because of this failure to adopt and maintain a sound salary policy the Federal Government has done a real injustice to its

employees and has lost many thousands of employees who were needed. By failing to retain their services, the Government has engaged in a practice which is costly and no doubt has had serious effects which may never be fully appraised. No organization, public or private, can afford to tolerate turnover of personnel at a rate which is depriving it of valuable manpower. That is the impersonal and businesslike aspect of this problem which the Government should not ignore.

And so, no matter how we approach this question of providing adequate salaries for our postal and classified personnel, we come to the same conclusion, namely, that there must be prompt action to provide the pay which will make available to the Government at all times the trained and experienced persons that are needed to conduct the public business.

Many Presidential Candidates Do Not Believe in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, with people all over the world fighting and dying for the right to vote, it is inconceivable the number of presidential candidates we have in the United States who do not believe in the right to vote.

The manner in which presidential candidates are shunning primaries in the various States makes it appear that they are afraid of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to add to these remarks an editorial that appeared in the Vilas County News-Review at Eagle River, Wis., which expresses my sentiments in every respect.

Many people in America are beginning to ask the same question.

The editorial follows:

UNDEMOCRATIC LEADERS BLOCK PRIMARIES

Though the Wisconsin presidential primary has been criticized as ineffectual—and called just so much eyewash by the former U.S. President, Harry Truman—it actually may be the most important political phenomena in this country.

It is the only open presidential primary in the United States. Though this primary, alone, cannot rectify the evils in our system of nominating presidential candidates, it serves as an example—a beacon in a sea of political darkness.

We are certain many other voters in the United States would appreciate the privilege of helping determine who will be the presidential candidates.

This is denied them by party bosses, and undemocratic politicians, who distrust the people—and actually distrust our American system of government by the people.

Democracy, with the worldwide threat of aggressive Red communism, and all the other forces opposed to it, faces severe tests in the future decades. We believe it will better face those tests, if some of the flaws in our system are corrected.

Surely there must be some U.S. legislators, not so kept by the party bosses, that would have the courage to organize and work for a nationwide presidential primary, along the lines of the Wisconsin primary.

This is not a new thought by the editors of this publication. We are merely endorsing the suggestion of too few of our leaders, who have seen the need for a national presidential primary.

As a protest against the highhanded attitude of our prominent national political leaders, we wish the voters would stay away from primaries, in droves, when all they ask is that we go to the polls to ratify a single selected candidate.

We do not want this to be construed as an attack against the apparently unopposed Republican presidential candidate, RICHARD NIXON, who certainly is in no way responsible for there being no nationwide system of presidential primaries.

But it most certainly is an attack on our leaders who resist and distrust democracy.

A new method should be worked out in the nationwide presidential primary where candidates could not duck having their names appear in primary elections in every State in the Union.

There probably would not even be a need for a wild, undemocratic, unfair nominating convention either. The winners could be certified on the basis of best showing in this primary and then in the autumn the voters would have their opportunity, just as now, to change their minds and vote differently—either Democratic, Republican—or if there is a third or fourth candidate, for someone else.

The secrecy of the ballot should be protected and voters not required to state their party affiliation—a commendable system as developed and perpetuated in Wisconsin elections.

Columnists Lawrence and Herling Help To Clarify Long-Range and Immediate Issues Involved in UAR Policy of Boycott and Blacklist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 4, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the Record an article by David Lawrence which deals expertly and perceptively with the basic and interrelated issues surrounding the anti-Israel and anti-American blacklist of the United Arab Republic.

While I have disagreed many times with Mr. Lawrence, I must say in all fairness and with objectivity that his article, which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of May 2, 1960, is one of the best to date in clarifying contradictions in our own policy and in Nasser's position. Unfortunately, as one will see upon reading Mr. Lawrence, Nasser's "having his cake and wanting to eat it too" policy has really gone unchallenged by our Government—to his advantage, of course.

Mr. Lawrence also touches on the action of the maritime unions in refusing to unload ships from the U.A.R. However, I think his real contribution lies in placing the entire U.A.R. policy and our reaction to it in proper and much-needed perspective.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I insert an article by John Herling, which deals with

the immediate issue of the loss of or threats to jobs of our American seamen as a result of Nasser's heretofore unchallenged actions. Mr. Herling's clear presentation of the facts appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 3, 1960.

I respectfully urge careful perusal of these two articles because in combination they offer an excellent study in the long-range and immediate issues surrounding the abusive and illegal actions of the U.A.R.

The two articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 2, 1960]

FULBRIGHT VERSUS CRITICS OF NASSER—SENATORS AT ODDS OVER U.S. REACTION TO DISPUTE ON ANTI-ISRAEL BLACKLIST

(By David Lawrence)

Does Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, speak for the Democratic Party when he takes the side of Dictator Nasser against the Israeli Government? Senators KENNEDY, HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, and JOHNSON disagree with the Arkansas Senator in his latest pronouncement that glosses over Nasser's refusal to open the Suez Canal to all shipping.

Senator FULBRIGHT in his statement castigates his fellow Senators—many of them liberal Democrats, like Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois—because they voted last week against the use of American taxpayers' funds to help Nasser carry on his economic boycott against another country in the free world.

The House of Representatives has adopted a similar provision advocating the principles of free navigation. For a majority derived from both political parties sees no reason why the U.S. Government should continue to send mutual security funds to Egypt if the latter seeks to destroy the economy of Israel, a country which also receives such funds from America.

Nasser has ignored the pleas of President Eisenhower to reopen the Suez Canal to the ships of all nations, though diplomatic help toward that end was promised by Mr. Eisenhower after Britain and France intervened in 1956 in the Middle East war. At least it was a factor in placating Israel, which early in 1957 withdrew its armed forces from the battle zones with that understanding.

The United Nations has tried repeatedly by its resolutions since 1948 to bring about a reconciliation between Israel and Egypt. But Nasser refuses to negotiate directly or indirectly. He says a state of war exists, and he uses that technical reason in trying to justify closing the Suez Canal to Israel's shipping.

If it be conceded that a "state of war" exists, then why did the World Bank, which is part of the United Nations organization, decide last December to make a loan of \$56 million to Egypt to widen and improve the Suez Canal? Cannot it be argued that the World Bank has thus taken sides in a "war" and has helped one of the so-called belligerents? Plainly Dictator Nasser cannot have it both ways.

Within the last few days another grave development has occurred. A maritime union in New York City decided not to help unload ships coming from Egypt. Immediately the maritime unions in Egypt and other Arab countries retaliated by refusing to unload American ships in their ports.

But the real reason for the boycott imposed in this country is the union's fear of damage to the jobs of American seamen in the future, because the Cairo Government persists in refusing to let ships from any country go through the canal if, at any time previously, they have carried cargoes to Israel. This means that American companies with products destined for other countries must maintain a fleet of ships